



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,644	03/30/2001	Andre Litster	3254.2.1	8266
21552	7590	07/14/2004	EXAMINER	
MADSON & METCALF GATEWAY TOWER WEST SUITE 900 15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101			EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	16

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/822,644	LITSTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick N. Edouard	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10, 13-30, 33-40 and 60-71 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 60-71 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-13-30 and 33-40 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communication filed 4/30/04 (paper #14).

Claims 1-10, 13-30, 33-40 and 60-72 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 60-71 are allowed.
3. Claims 9 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-10, 13 30 and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The limitation "wherein at least one association is specific to a particular application program and at least one association is applicable to a plurality of different application programs" is not described in the specification to enable one of ordinary skill in the art as to how to use and make it. Indeed, the specification on pages

Art Unit: 2654

8, line 3 to pages 11 lines 16 do not describe this limitation. However, Applicant is advised to point out where this limitation is described in the specification.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4/30/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

In response to Applicant's argument that "these claims features allow associations between languages keys and language sensitive elements to be application program specific i.e., different language keys may have different meanings depending on which application program is accessing them" , the examiner cannot concur. In fact, the features upon which the Applicant relied upon were rejected under 112 para for not being described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-6, 10, 13-26, 30, and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin et al (6,490,547) in view of Bell (6,275,978).

As per claims 1, 21 and 40, Atkin et al teach a system for providing multiple language support for at least one application program, (figures 2-3) the system comprising:

"A plurality of language resource bundles comprising association between languages keys and displayable language sensitive elements, each resource bundle corresponding to a different language"(col. 3, lines 36-67, his resource bundle 208 with different natural languages being supported by different resource bundles that comprises text string with identifiers)

"A language resource manager configured to receive a first language key from an application program, locate a language resource bundle corresponding to a currently-selected language, identify a language sensitive element associated with the first language key, and provide the identified language sensitive element to the application program for display in a graphical user interface" (col. 3, lines 36-67, his language management module is used by the user to select the language in which text strings for user application are to be displayed within the user interface and causes the appropriate resource bundle to be loaded).

It is noted that Atkin et al teaches the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach wherein one association is specific to a particular application. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Bell who teaches at col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 38 the use of a second key to assist the resource bundle generator in the localization of the input string wherein the second key is descriptive and provide some context with respect to the specific application to be translated. Therefore, one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into Aktin the context key specific to an application as taught Bell because it would provide for an increase in the reliability of the localization.

Atkin et al further teach at least one association is applicable to a plurality of applications (Col. 4, lines 16-42).

As per claims 2 and 22 , Atkin et al teach an application program configured to provide a language key to the language resource manager, receive a language sensitive element from the language resource manager and display the language sensitive element in a graphical user interface" (col. 3, lines 40-56, when a user selects a particular human language for user application , language manager modules causes the appropriate resource bundle to be loaded).

As per claims 3 and 23, Atkin et al teach wherein at least one language sensitive element is selected from the group consisting of a text string, an icon, a graphic and a video clip"(col. 3, lines 36-44, user applications includes a number of functional modules with user interfaces including text strings...).

As per claims 4 and 4, Atkin et al teach wherein the language resource manger is further configured to display a language switching mechanism in the graphical user interface for changing the currently selected language in response to user input"(figure 3, col. 4, lines 53 to col. 5, line 40, upon requesting by the user a change in the human language in which the user interface is displayed, the requested language is loaded if it supported by the user application).

Art Unit: 2654

As per claims 2 and 25, Atkin et al teach wherein the language switching mechanism is selected from the group consisting of drop down list, a menu, a button, an edit box and an icon (col. 4, line 64-66, the user interface text in requested language using for instance a drop down list or a menu is loaded).

As per claims 10, 13- 20, 30 and 33-39, Atkin et al teach wherein the language resource manager is in communication with a plurality of applications...(His language management module 204).

As per claim 6 and 26, Atkin et al teach wherein the language resource manger is further configured to change the currently selected language in response to at least one keystroke (col. 4, lines 57-59, the user requested the language changed using for instance one keystroke).

2. Claims 7-8 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin et al (6,490,547) in view of Bell (6,265,978) as applied to claim 1 and 21 above and further in view of

It is noted that Atkin ('547) teaches a user requested a change in the human language in which the user interface is displayed and if the requested language is supported by the user application , the user interface is loaded, but does not explicitly teach a language switching component configured to receive from the language resource manager a second language sensitive element and replace the first language sensitive element with the second language sensitive element in the graphical user interface. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Hetherington et

al who teach a method for dynamic language switching wherein user interface dialogs may reload the contents of displays , updating the user interface display to contain the contents of menu labels, help text in the new human language or display text formatted in accordance with the new cultural convention at he abstract and col. 4, lines 11-65. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate into the combination (Aktin with Bell) a language switching component as taught by Hetherington because it would enable remote support by users employing different languages, setting user interface display languages based on user preference.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) Or:

(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.,Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

Art Unit: 2654

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (703) 305-9645.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 305-9508. Alternatively, facsimile messages may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the examiner's voice mailbox (telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

July 8, 2004



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PATENT EXAMINER